



ERDAL'S REGULATION ON THE BLIND REVIEW PROCEDURES

Art. 1

Necessity of the anonymous review procedure

1. Each article intended for publication in the review is subjected to the anonymous double-blind review procedure governed by these regulations, in compliance with the principles of transparency, correctness, impartiality, confidentiality, independence of the reviewers with respect to the governing bodies of the Review, respect for freedom of scientific research, and in general conditions of absence of conflicts of interest for all people involved in the procedure.

Art. 2

Activation of the anonymous review procedure

1. The reviewing procedure required by Article 1 is conducted by any of the editors, following a preliminary positive assessment of the compliance with the minimum criteria of scientific adequacy of the paper and its relevance to the thematic areas of the Review.
2. The editor who takes the initiative is required to activate the review procedure if he has verified that there is space available for publication in one of the subsequent scheduled issues.
3. A contribution may not be subject to several reviewing procedures on the initiative of several publishers at the same time.

Art. 3

Conducting the anonymous review procedure

1. The paper subject to review is made anonymous through the omission of the author's name and the concealment of any information that, even indirectly, can lead back to the identity of the author.



2. The anonymised paper is sent by the editor, who takes care of the procedure, to a reviewer who has been identified to be among the scholars with proven competence in the thematic area of the paper, together with the reviewer form published in Annex A, which is an integral part of this regulation.
3. In no case can one of the editors or a member of the editorial board be called to be a reviewer; the members of the scientific committee may occasionally be called to be a reviewer.
4. The editor and the reviewer are bound by secrecy about the designation.
5. The reviewer shall return the completed form to the editor within fourteen days of receiving it.
6. The reviewer evaluates:
 - a. the completeness, linearity, clarity, relevance and consistency in dealing with the issue;
 - b. the degree of depth in the profiles investigated;
 - c. the author's critical contribution and its methodological and argumentative rigor;
 - d. the originality and innovativeness of the contribution;
 - e. the international relevance of the contribution;
 - f. the impact and usefulness of the contribution for the advancement of knowledge and the scientific progress;
 - g. the completeness and relevance of bibliographic, normative and jurisprudential references;
 - h. the compliance with Erdal's editorial rules.
7. The reviewer may give rise to one of the following outcomes:
 - a. acceptance subject to minor revisions;
 - b. acceptance subject to significant reviews;
 - c. request for rewriting and resending the contribution;
 - d. rejection, or evaluation of non-publication.
8. The reviewer's evaluation always takes place in full compliance with the author's freedom of scientific research, so the outcome of the review cannot contain the request for citation of specific works; if such indications are present in the form they must be considered in any case as non-binding advice.
9. The Review keeps a confidential copy of all the evaluation forms, together with the names of the reviewers to whom they are associated.



10. In case of declared impossibility of the reviewer to return the completed form, or failure to respect the deadline provided in the paragraph 5 of this article, the editor will replace the reviewer, repeating the procedure provided in paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of this Article.

Art. 4

Consequences of the review procedure

1. In the event that the procedure provided in article 3 gives rise to acceptance, the outcome of the evaluation, without indicating the name of the reviewer, is forwarded to the author of the contribution, in order to make him aware of the outcome of the assessment and any requests for revision.
2. In the event that the procedure provided for in Article 3 gives rise to a request for rewriting and re-submission of the paper or to an evaluation of rejection by the reviewer, the contribution is subject to a second evaluation, by a different reviewer identified by the same editor who took the initiative, according to the same procedure provided for in Article 3.
3. If the second reviewer also expresses an assessment with a request for rewriting and re-submission or rejection, the contribution shall not be published, and the results of the assessment, without any indication of the names of the reviewers, shall be communicated to the author of the contribution, in order to make them aware of the outcome of the assessment.
4. If the second reviewer expresses a different evaluation than the first reviewer who issued the request for revision, the editor who initially started the review procedure will identify a third reviewer based on the procedure provided for in Article 3, and the contribution is considered to be publishable, with or without requests for revisions, if two out of three reviewers have expressed approval.
5. If the procedure provided for in paragraphs 3 and 4 has been activated, the results of the evaluations, without indicating the names of the reviewers, are forwarded to the author of the contribution, in order to inform them of the outcome of the evaluation and of any requests for revision to be made.
6. In the event of a positive outcome of the review, if there has been requests for revisions, the author will return the contribution in the final version, and the editor who oversaw the procedure will check and guarantee that the changes made take



into account what has been requested by the reviewer.

7. The qualification of “Article subjected to blinded peer review” is reported in the initial note of the contribution.

Art. 5

Specific and particular cases

1. When an article is written by one of the editors, the review procedure is handled by another editor, who takes care to ensure the freedom and anonymity of the reviewer.
2. The editors may establish that individual articles, on the basis of the proven authority and clear reputation of the author, can be exempted from the review procedure.